

Jack
Martin

J. S. Martin,
P. O. Box 30,357,
New Orleans, Louisiana, 70130.

Phone: C-A 504, 943-6949

Wednesday, 19th April, 1967.

Hon. Hale Boggs, M.C., D.La.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Hale:

Please forgive this very poor letter. I've been rather full of late, and together with other pressing issues, it failed to help matters along any, if you know what I mean, as I'm very sure you do. However, in view of our long standing personal friendship, and your good service as a member of the Warren Commission, I implore you to read this letter, and the documents and statements, and give them the consideration, in complete detail, as they deserve.

I believe you are entitled to an explanation of the circumstances, and for the moment this is all I can do, by reading the enclosed text you can put it all in perspective for yourself. Although, please be advised that I am in this issue having become involved as an individual as it were. In short, I have no air to give support of the Warren Commission or the so-called Government. In other words I have no opinions one way or the other. But I'm caught-in-between, as the saying is, and as you can see by the attached instrument.

My business has cost me every ounce of credibility and I'm now left with nothing to build. These people say that I'm a liar and that I'm a B... which is a damn lie. I have many relatives, officials, members of the press, and countless others I could parade on a witness stand which would disprove the allegations concerning my "giving bad information to the police", being a "courthouse hanger around", and a "drunken bull". Many of these wild statements made against me, I feel were opinionated projections of a very prejudicial source, and for more reasons than those evident, were those made and was I misquoted. I was misquoted, because all I did was refer to a news article, which these minions of the press could never find a copy of (I was able to, as it's in the attached documents), in an effort to explain the level of intelligence of the person I was talking about at that time. Because of this, I also went into other possibilities of this man's abilities, which were confused too. In short, it was misunderstood, misquoted mess, from start to finish, and I've suffered for it.

If you would be kind enough to read this text, and so advise the Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, as well as others in this regard, at least I'd feel better about it, and it might clear the air a little. For your able assistance I'll be forever grateful. As ever-

Respectfully yours,

JACK

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to my attorney, dated April 19, 1967.

J. S. Martin,
P. O. Box 30,357,
New Orleans, Louisiana, 70130.

Phone.. C-A 504, 943-6949

Wednesday, 19th April, 1967.

Hon. Russell B. Long, D.La.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Buck:

I implore you...Please read the attached correspondence, and documentary file enclosed, it means a great deal to me to have your attention drawn to this issue, as well as your very able assistance in this matter. As you will notice, I've included a copy of a recent letter to our mutual friend the Hon. Hale Boggs regarding this situation.

If you remember correctly one of the people both you and I assisted several years ago did their best to hurt me. We, or rather you, per my request at that time did this man one hell of a favor. Of course I stuck my neck out the most. He needed help and I did my best through you even though I should have known better at the time. After all, I'd caught the guy in several deals prior to then for my clients, but he pleaded that he'd mend his ways, and I believed him at the time and got you to help him. Shortly afterwards however, if you remember correctly I wrote you withdrawing my support in his regard because I found out he was using me. Although, at the time if you remember it was too late, and you advised me accordingly, so I let the matter drop. This guy's name was Carl John Stanley. When you see the enclosed text, perhaps you'll remember...Perhaps some day far distant, this guy might mend his ways, but I doubt it. Although, I can't help but believing that everybody has the right, or should have, at least one more chance to start over again, regardless of how bad they may seem. And I've always even tried to help those I've caught if I could, and I felt they were sincere, as was this case, at that particular time.

As you can see, I've been blasted but good. If you'll read my letter to Hale (enclosed), the letter to my attorney, the other material, make copies of same and forward these up with Hale to the Hon. Mr. Hoover, and others concerned, I'll be so ever indebted to you. Thanks in advance, with every good wish, I remain-

Respectfully, your friend,

Jack
JACK

PS: Please tell Mr. Hoover that I want no one hurt over this, like the loss of a job, et cetera...These are good people, but just a bit confused at that time. PLEASE EXCUSE THIS POOR LETTER...I HAVE NOT BEEN WELL FOR WHILE NOW, DO

J. S. Martin,
P. O. Box 30,357,
New Orleans, Louisiana, 70130.

Phone: C-A 504, 943-6949

Wednesday, 19th April, 1967.

Hon. Steven R. Plotkin, Esq.,
Law Firm: Plotkin, Alvarez & Sapir,
Suite 900,
Baronne Building,
New Orleans, Louisiana, 70112.

My Dear Friend, Steve:

After our brief telephone conversations over the week-end, I started thinking about the various legal matters, their many possible complications involved, together with the numerous aspects of their ethical feasibility, et cetera; these sundry legal interests which now rest in your very able hands and concern my future. Therefore, for the moment I advocate complete suspension of our due-legal-process altogether, so in the meantime please enclose this letter, all other notes, evidence, and facts, in my personal "Comment-Report-Dossier" file, and hold everything in abeyance for some later reference if they are ever needed as a defensive measure rather than an offensive action in law (damage suit): Temporarily, at least.

My reasons for this attitude are legion. However, such an act upon my part might well clear my name; but by the same token it also may cast unnecessary and uncalled for distrust towards our Government or some of its agencies in the end result. If that were the case, I could never personally erase such distrust, or contempt for myself from my conscience for having been the possible instrument of such an act...Inasmuch as, it's my own candid opinion that any American of even mediocre patriotic loyalty during these present controversial times should stand by, and back-up his country, rather than involve himself in some act which might tend to confuse its citizens regarding its true intent of purpose, and otherwise damage its very sincere public image. Suffice it to say, under these conditions, and for these reasons, I can not engage those concerned, nor those facets of Government, and expose either them or myself to the tender mercies of public opinion or the legal profession.

Steve, as you know I've always remained neutral, neither pro or con relative to the Warren Commission (or such activities), nor (have I ever been) an "enthusiastic supporter" of the current Garrison-Probe (even though some press-authorities have said otherwise). To the contrary, I've always tried to cooperate to the fullest extent with all of the Government Offices and Agencies (Federal, State, Parish, and City), regardless of any issue or of the personalities involved in a humble step towards good citizenship. Moreover, I also feel that any move (legal) that we might take at this time could well be misconstrued, and that this is not the time for such a sensationalistic venture.

Furthermore, I shudder to think of our nations future lawyers referring to the "Martin Case" in their appeals and other legal actions for years to come. Stop and think! The die has already been cast, as such legal precedent has already been established. By this I mean in quoting the "Martin Case" as an instance where Government itself broke the old legal rule of accepted legal pro-

Mr. Flotman 4-19-1967, continued, page 2

cedure, the "confidential-immunity-of-an-informant" and set an entire new legal precedent by their act in my case... When I was exposed publicly through the press by an act at the hand of Government in the legal execution of this new precedent of law. Hence, legal precedent is itself established at this very moment, and could now be used by any selfish interest. I say this, as at the time I spoke to these people I did invoke such confidential-informant-immunity, upon each and every occasion, and under the existing conditions it was accepted. This is another reason for the way I feel at the time concerning holding up on matters. In short, if we push this case now, we've published openly the fact that the confidential immunity of an informant no longer exists by Government's Legal Precedent in or by Government's Procedures in the "Martin Case", et cetera. When the only immediate remedy to this that I can see, is to be quiet for the moment, letting this matter die in silence and thus, thus, time might cure all through silence in this instance.

Another item which plagues me to no end is the fact that there might be the first (or one of the first) cases in which an actual judgment is secured against a police official (the agents of the F.B.I. and Secret Service are police), and under present High Court ruling this could be done, that is in a suit brought against each individual for acting out of concern for personal or other reasons, et cetera, or the like. After all, I had never been informed that such oral interviews might be harmful, or used in my case. Neither was I ever furnished a copy of such statements referred to. However, I can see no satisfaction by all of this, because about all that might happen would be that those involved might lose their positions, and I wouldn't let myself do this to those men who have to all times given good service to our government prior to this occasion in some ways. So again, we have another reason not to continue this case.

Frankly, the only satisfaction I can see that might be forthcoming would be in the form of some very weak press release which would in all likelihood say something like: "Due to the extreme pressure of the moment and the multiple interrogations made at that time, it has been found that between the interview and the particular time the reports were written some of the facts were confused. Therefore, many of the statements allegedly made by Martin were incorrect and at that time were made by another informant." As you can see, this would avail us no credibility, which has been lost, and all but put me out of business, so to speak... There would have to be something else to clear the air and to stabilize matters, and for the moment to this there is no answer except one I have in mind. Although, this law suit would fail to remedy this ailment, as it would every other for the moment, so what's the use of wasting our time, et cetera. Furthermore, I really think that it was a matter of confusion at the time these reports were made, for more reasons than one, by the misquotations, et cetera. Hence, we're right back where we started from.

So let's forget it for the moment. With every good wish, I remain-

Respectfully yours,

John